

## REMARKS

Applicant, in consideration of O.A. mailed 09/22/2004 prepared the following answers  
5 numbered in correspondence to the numbered paragraphs of said O.A.:

Points 1,2. Applicant resubmits IDS.

Point 3. Drawings have been amended in consideration of amendments in disclosure and  
10 claims. Applicant encloses formal drawings and a bracket/underlining copy of old drawings.

Old Figures 1,2,3,4, 10 have been deleted.

Old fig. 5 is new fig. 7.

Old fig. 6 is new fig. 2.

15 Old fig. 7 is new fig. 3.

Old fig. 8 is new fig. 4.

New fig. 1 is new but can be considered as a part of old fig. 6.

Point 4. Abstract has been made more concise.

20

Point 5. Spelling errors in disclosure have been checked.

Point 6.

a) "of" has been deleted.

b) "two" has been deleted in both occurrences.

25 c) "a same item" has been changed in "a same items"

d, e) Claim 5,6 have been deleted.

Point 9.

1/9).

30 Applicant amended claim 1.

Applicant drafted new claim 14 introducing limitations for indicating a structure not shown in Roth.

2/9).

To better make clear the differences Applicant submits both structures:

35 A) Roth's structure comprises:

a) a shoulder strap having ending ring shaped connectors

b) one cable 2 having two sides 2.1,2.2

c) said one cable connected to both ring shaped connectors

16

d) one precisely claimed L shaped hook threaded by cable 2 for hooking a load in one point

e) L shaped hook is located at the center of cable 2.

B) My structure comprises:

- 5 a) a shoulder strap having ending ring shaped connectors
- b) two cables 2,2' (new fig. 7)
- c) only one side of each cable connected to one ring shaped connector
- d) two hooks 8,8' for hooking a load in two points
- e e) each hook is located at the end of each cable

10 3/9).

"Patent Yourself", 8th edition, page 5/14 recits:

"Many laypersons believe that if an invention consist entirely of old components, it can't be patented. A moment's reflection will show that this couldn't be true, since most inventions are made of old components. Thus, the PTO will consider your invention novel if two or more prior-art references (actual devices or published descriptions) together account for all of your invention's physical characteristics. That is, if your invention is a new combination of two old features, the law will consider it novel. For your invention to be considered as lacking novelty and thus subject to rejection under Section 102 of the patent laws, all of its physical characteristics must exist in a single prior art reference."

20 4/9).

In Roth there is a precisely claimed L shaped hook, which is not present in my application. 5/9).

Roth's L shaped hook has, just as L letter, a very tiny hooking protrusion. It's scope is not the proper meaning of "hooking an object", (action that is commonly intended to include a part of the object in the internal of a hook) but to slightly penetrate in it with its tiny teeth, for anti-slipping purposes. In Roth there is only one cable threaded through said L shaped cable and located at its center, while in my new claim 19 there are two cables, each having a hook in ending position.

30 6/9).

These physical differences are followed by different scopes, as Roth precisely restricted his claims to the scope of carrying items such as furniture, doors and like, while the transportation of plastic bags is an object of new claim 19 (amended old claim 1). 7/9).

35 Applicant hopes that new claim 19) makes clear that parts b) and d) in Roth are different from the parts b) and d) of my application; and that connection structures c), e) of Roth differ from my connection structures c), e). Differences in hardware and in method should here result, as in Roth there are not two cables, nor two hooks, nor the carrying method permits the item to be carried to be hooked in two of its points.

Point 10.

1/10).

Applicant amended old claim 1

- 5 Applicant drafted new claim 14 introducing limitations for indicating a structure not shown in Mc Clintock.

2/10).

To better make clear the differences Applicant submits both structures:

A) Mc Clintock's structure comprises in combination:

- 10 a) an elastic band 12 to be arranged under the armpits of a user  
b) a collar strap having ending ring shaped connectors and having slots for elastic band 12 to be threaded through;  
c) attachment means, including D rings and adjustable strap 26.

The structure is based on the use in combination of the neck, both armpits and of

- 15 both shoulders of a user.

In fact the drawings show carried loads that are all located on the front side of user. This can happen only thanks to the fact that the strap is a collar strap kept in place by the neck of user and by the elastic band passing under his armpits, which is a physical difference with my structure. Also if user "can" use the device for the scope of carrying a load front-back connected, for this scope the structure is redundant in respect to my device.

20

B) My structure comprises:

- a) a shoulder strap having ending ring shaped connectors  
b) two cables 2,2' (new fig. 7)  
25 c) two hooks 8,8' for hooking a load in two points

3.10).

"Patent it Yourself", page 5/13 8th edition recits:

"Even omitting an element can be considered novel. For example, if a machine has always had four gears, and you find that it will work with three, you've satisfied the novelty requirement."

30

4/10).

Applicant hopes that new claim 19 (amended old claim 1) makes clear that my device works without collar strap and without elastic band, that it has structural and method differences as it works in a different way, and that it cannot work in Mc Clintock's way (eg.: carrying all the load on front side of user). Vice-versa Mc.Clintock's device, if used for the carrying of plastic bags, should result having more than one difference from my carrying system as claimed in new claim 19, which in that case should also perform the same result (the carrying of plastic bags) omitting more than one element.

35

5/10).

18

Further, different scope is claimed by Mc Clintock, which is specifically related to the carrying of photo gear ("a multi use camera harness", specifically claimed in Mc Clintock's claim 1).

5 Point 12.

12/1).

Applicant amended claim 1 in consideration of the fact that "prior art fails to show or teach a shoulder strap system similar to that claimed having the anchor-shaped element...".

12/2).

10 Applicant amended claim 3 and drafted new claim 15 in consideration of the fact that "prior art fails to show or teach a shoulder strap system similar to that claimed having ....the transversal element".

Point 13.

15 Applicant thanks Examiner for having drafted for him an allowable claim, which is new claim 18.

Drawings have been amended consequently to specification and claims amendments , in the following way:

20

a) old figures 1,2,3,4,10 have been deleted.

b) old figure 5 is now fig. 7

c) old fig. 6 is now fig. 2.

d) old fig. 7 is now fig. 3.


25 e) old fig. 8 is now fig. 4.

f) old fig. 9 is now fig. 5.

g) new figg.s 1,6 are new

30 Applicant thanks Examiner for her very kind assistance, and hopes with her help to overcome all problems.

Very respectfully.



35

Applicant  
(Giancarlo Caputi)

Date: Jan 18, 2005.